arXiv:1303.3823v2 [nlin.CD] 24 Mar 2013

On one-chiral-sector-dominated turbulence states

Jian-Zhou Zhu[1] **and Weihong Yang**[2]

[1]WCI Center for Fusion Theory, National Fusion Research Institute, 169-148 Gwahak-ro, Daejeon, Korea
[2]Department of Modern Physics, University of Science and Technology of China, 230026 Hefei, China

(Received ?; revised ?; accepted ?. - To be entered by editorial office)

Left- and right-handed helical modes' statistical absolute equilibria appear *separately*. If both chiral sectors present, one can dominate around its positive pole, which is relevant to the nearly maximally helical (force free for magnetic field) states of turbulence. Pure magnetodynamics (PMD, or electron magnetohydrodynamics — EMHD), pure hydrodynamics (PHD), and, single-fluid and two-fluid MHDs are studied. Relevant documented data and issues of cascade properties, and, helical and nonhelical dynamos are revisited. We also discuss new scenarios, such as PMD inverse magnetic helicity and forward energy cascades, and, the continuous transition from completely-inverse to partly-inverse-and-partly-forward and to completely-forward energy transfers in PHD.

Key words:

---

1. Helical turbulence and absolute equilibrium, and, helical decomposition

Nearly maximally helical (*force free* for magnetic field) states are ubiquitous in hydrodynamic-type systems. Such states are dominantly left- or right-handed, showing strong *chirality*† signatured and quantified by helicity and its relevant derivatives. Recognizing the importance of helicity in hydrodynamic turbulence however is relatively new, though Helmholtz-Kelvin theorem is old (Moffatt 2008). Indeed, statistical absolute equilibrium (AE) energy equipartition among each Fourier modes was explicitly formulated by Lee (1952) for both pure hydrodynamics (PHD) and magnetohydrodynamics (MHD). Lee did not consider the invariance of helicity‡ which can also be involved in the equipartitions (Kraichnan 1973; Frisch et al. 1975). Now, tremendous progresses with helical decomposition have been made (see, e.g., Yang, Su & Wu 2010, and references therein): "Degenerate states", *i.e.*, the left-handed and right-handed helical modes for each wavenumber are exposed (Moses 1971; Waleffe 1992). The dynamics of the two coupled chiral sectors can be effectively diagonalized (Chen, Chen & Eyink 2003), and can even be numerically isolated to show novel features (Biferale, Musacchio & Toschi 2012). Further more, as we will see, the AE wavenumber spectra are cleanly split into two chiral sectors which contain poles of opposite signs¶. One sector dominates around its positive pole (negative pole is not reachable as $k > 0$), which appears to be the origin of the one-chiral-sector-dominated turbulence states (OCSDSs) that is mentioned in the beginning and to which we will come back soon.

† This notion was called *dissymmetry*, which is still occasionally used, before Kelvin (1904) and various attempts have been made to quantify it (see, *e.g.*, the review by Petitjean 2003).

‡ Later, Betchov (1961) first reported, with minor mistakes (Frisch et al. 1975), invariant helicity's role in turbulence, contrasting a box of nails to screws for the lack of reflexion symmetry.

¶ Similar to the (bio)chemistry *enantiomer excess* and its amplification (see, *e.g.*, Cintas & Viedma 2012, and references therein): We will try to avoid but not to completely exclude the chemical and/or biological terminologies. Interestingly, Betchov (1961) explicitly referred to the structure of dextrose.

Kraichnan (1967, 1973, hereafter K67 and K73) established in a more explicit and complete way the AE for both two-dimensional (2D) and 3D incompressible PHD. Fourier modes beyond $[k_{min}, k_{max}]$ being discarded (Galerkin truncation), certain rugged invariants, such as the energy ($\mathcal{E}_K$) and enstrophy (for 2D) or helicity ($\mathcal{H}_K$, for 3D), are still conserved. With the constraints of these rugged invariants, Kraichnan obtained the respective energy spectral densities for 2D and 3D: $\overline{U}_K(k) = 1/(\alpha + \beta k^2)$ and $U_K(k) = 2\alpha/(\alpha^2 - \beta^2 k^2)$ respectively. $U_K(k)$ for 3D, for instance, can be derived immediately from the Gibbs distribution $\exp\{-(\alpha\mathcal{E}_K + \beta\mathcal{H}_K)\}$, where α is the temperature parameter associated with energy and β with helicity (enstrophy in 2D).[‖] K67 showed that low enstrophy state in 2D corresponds to a negative β, indicating condensation of energy at smallest k with a roughly (smoothed) $\llcorner\!\_$ shape spectral density (*c.f.*, similar MHD figures in Frisch et al. (1975)). In 3D, there is no such negative temperature state (due to the realizability condition from the positive definiteness of the quadratic form) but only $\_\!\lrcorner$ shape spectral density, and low helicity state corresponds to vanishing β and equipartition of energy. Inverse energy cascade was then argued for 2D but disputed for 3D.

K73 already exploited pure helical Fourier modes which come from helical decomposition: For a 3D transverse field (velocity $\boldsymbol{u}$, vorticity $\boldsymbol{\omega} = \nabla \times \boldsymbol{u}$ and the transverse component of vector potential $\boldsymbol{A}$ of magnetic field $\boldsymbol{B}$ etc.) in a cyclic box of volume, say, $\mathcal{V} = (2\pi)^3$, it reads

$$\boldsymbol{v} = \sum_{\boldsymbol{k}} \hat{\boldsymbol{v}}(\boldsymbol{k}) e^{\hat{i}\boldsymbol{k}\cdot\boldsymbol{r}} = \sum_{c} \boldsymbol{v}^c = \sum_{\boldsymbol{k},c} \hat{v}^c(\boldsymbol{k}) \hat{\boldsymbol{h}}_c(\boldsymbol{k}) e^{\hat{i}\boldsymbol{k}\cdot\boldsymbol{r}}. \tag{1.1}$$

Here $\hat{i}^2 = -1$ and the indexes "c" is for "chirality" ("+" or "-") with $c^2 = 1$; and the helical mode bases (complex eigenvectors of the curl operator) have the following properties $\hat{i}\boldsymbol{k} \times \hat{\boldsymbol{h}}_c(\boldsymbol{k}) = ck\hat{\boldsymbol{h}}_c(\boldsymbol{k})$, $\hat{\boldsymbol{h}}_c(-\boldsymbol{k}) = \hat{\boldsymbol{h}}_c^*(\boldsymbol{k}) = \hat{\boldsymbol{h}}_{-c}(\boldsymbol{k})$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{h}}_{c_1}(\boldsymbol{k}) \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{h}}_{c_2}^*(\boldsymbol{k}) = \delta_{c_1,c_2}$ (Euclidean norm). Corresponding densities can be defined accordingly: For instance, *mean* (per unite volume or statistically averaged, as denoted by $\langle \bullet \rangle$) magnetic energy $\mathcal{E}_M = \tilde{\sum}_{c,\boldsymbol{k}} U_M^c(k) = \tilde{\sum}_{c,\boldsymbol{k}} \langle |\hat{B}^c(\boldsymbol{k})|^2 \rangle /2$ and helicity $\mathcal{H}_M = \tilde{\sum}_{\boldsymbol{k},c} Q_M^c(k) = \tilde{\sum}_{\boldsymbol{k},c} ckU_M^c(k)$. Other derivatives such as the relative helicity defined by the total helicity and energy densities $|kQ_M(k)|/[U_M(k)] = k\sum_c Q_M^c(k)/\sum_c U_M^c(k)$ (Kraichnan 1973) can be used for quantifying the degree of chirality.[†]

Waleffe (1992), Galtier et al. (2000) (see also Lessinnes, Plunian & Carati 2009) and Galtier & Bhattacharjee (2003) have respectively looked into the detailed interacting triads of the helical Fourier modes in Navier-Stokes, MHD and PMD (or EMHD). And, theories and techniques of the AE have been well described in the literature and do not require any further elaboration here. For instance, it is routinary to check Liouville theorem and rugged conservation properties after Galerkin truncation, which is true for all the models studied here. We progressively perform a minimal but

---

[‖] We adopt K73 notations and definitions: $\mathcal{E}_K = \tilde{\sum}_{\boldsymbol{k}} U_K(k) \to \tilde{\int} dk 4\pi k^2 U_K(k)$ and $\mathcal{H}_K = \tilde{\sum}_{\boldsymbol{k}} Q_K(k) \to \tilde{\int} dk 4\pi k^2 Q_K(k)$ in continuous-k limit, where $\tilde{\bullet}$ implies restricting to the subset of surviving modes. We will always use α for energy related temperature parameter and β for helicity. Self-evident index, such as M for "magnetic", when necessary for discrimination, will be added to β, U, Q, $\mathcal{E}$ and $\mathcal{H}$ etc. And, for simplicity we will always use Gibbs ensemble calculation and will not repeatedly formulate and explain. The general results of this paper are not affected by the differences between an infinite domain and a finite cyclic box, so we may switch between these two descriptions, depending on which one is more convenient. Difference of a factor of 2 may arise, depending on how one treats the realizability condition and the invariant(s) (summation over the whole or half of the wavenumber domain etc.), and yet another freedom about the sign of helicity is of one's free choice. Spectra in this paper may also be obtained in other approaches, such as finding the stationary solution of characteristic functions, which can avoid explicitly resorting to the Gibbs distribution (Private communication with E. A. Kuznetsov).

[†] Note that we have used Coulomb gauge $\hat{\boldsymbol{A}} \cdot \boldsymbol{k} = 0$, so $\hat{i}\boldsymbol{k} \times [\hat{i}\boldsymbol{k} \times \hat{\boldsymbol{A}}(\boldsymbol{k})] = k^2 \hat{\boldsymbol{A}}(\boldsymbol{k}) = \hat{i}\boldsymbol{k} \times \hat{\boldsymbol{B}}(\boldsymbol{k})$: The longitudinal component of $\boldsymbol{A}$ with whatever gauge is not involved in the relevant calculations, so Coulomb gauge is not really necessary but brings symbolic convenience. Note also that helical *wave*, with the time argument included, is *truly* chiral in the sense of Barron (see, *e.g.*, Cintas & Viedma 2012).

systematic examination of pure magneto-dynamics (PMD, also called electron MHD, EMHD, in literature: §2.1), PHD (§2.2), and, single-fluid (§2.3.1) and two-fluid (§2.3.2) MHDs. The feature of OCSDS of magnetic helicity inversely to large scales in PMD is the prototype for all models involving the magnetic field, and the feature of PHD forward cascade of "everything" is a prototype for small-scale, say much smaller than electron skin depth, regimes for EMHD and two-fluid MHD. For a unichiral subsystem of PHD, a negative temperature state supporting large-scale energy condensation and that inverse energy cascade (Biferale, Musacchio & Toschi 2012) is supported. OCSDSs can be found in many published numerical results, and some authors (*e.g.*, Meneguzzi, Frisch & Pouquet 1981; Brandenburg, Dobler & Subramanian 2002) even have already explicitly pointed them out. Our purpose is to lay out the basic AE as a first step to explore the fundamentals of turbulent transfers, especially for a comprehensive understanding relevant helicity effects.‡ The focus is the most basic new insights attached to the chirally decomposed AE, with which we will revisit the most relevant studies, rather than any specific quantitative turbulence theories, such as the wave turbulence theories nicely established by Galtier and collaborators (Galtier et al. 2000; Galtier & Bhattacharjee 2003), which requires extra further systematic treatments, though our result may be used as a benchmark of relevant analytical or numerical treatments.

2. One-chiral-sector-dominated absolute equilibrium and turbulence states

Basic notations, definitions and calculation techniques are given in the introduction of K67 and K73 theories and helical decompositions in §1.

2.1. *Pure magneto-dynamics (PMD)*

We call the model $\partial_t \boldsymbol{B} + \nabla \times \big[(\nabla \times \boldsymbol{B}) \times \boldsymbol{B}\big] = 0$ ideal PMD, because only magnetic field is involved. It is also called EMHD in literature, and it is the limit of vanishing electron inertial of normal PMD/EMHD (see, e.g., Biskamp et al. 1999). This PMD model is relevant to helicons or whistler waves in solid conductor (including neutron star's solid crust), atmosphere etc. Note that, in the sense of EMHD, $\boldsymbol{B}$ is "frozen in" to the electron fluid velocity $\boldsymbol{u_e} = -\nabla \times \boldsymbol{B}$. Rugged invariants are magnetic energy and helicity (Galtier & Bhattacharjee 2003)

$$\mathcal{E}_M = \frac{1}{2\mathcal{V}} \int \boldsymbol{B}^2 d^3\boldsymbol{r} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\boldsymbol{k},c} |\hat{B}^c(\boldsymbol{k})|^2, \ \ \mathcal{H}_M = \frac{1}{2\mathcal{V}} \int \boldsymbol{A} \cdot \boldsymbol{B} d^3\boldsymbol{r} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\boldsymbol{k},c} c|\hat{B}^c(\boldsymbol{k})|^2/k.$$

The chirally decomposed AE spectral densities (*c.f.*, §1) of energy and helicity are then

$$U^c_M(k) = k/(c\beta + \alpha k) \text{ and } Q^c_M(k) = 1/(\beta + c\alpha k) = cU^c_M(k)/k. \tag{2.1}$$

From the above spectral relations, just as K67, but with energy playing the role of enstrophy there, a low energy state corresponds to condensation of Q at smallest wanumbers, due to the positive pole of one of the chiral sectors, say $c = +$ with $\beta < 0 < \alpha$. The implication for turbulence is inverse helicity and forward energy transfers, when scale separation is satisfied. In principle, as long as there is net helicity with $\beta \neq 0$, one chiral sector has the opportunity to dominate at large scales (*i.e.*, OCSDS close to the positive pole $k_p = -c\beta/\alpha$), though commonly done in experiment to provoke EMHD turbulence is to impose a background magnetic field (see, e.g., Stenzel 1999) which guides the waves. If helicity is injected at some intermediate k, we should see dominant inverse helicity and forward energy transfers. If the transfers are approximable by self-similar local cascades and that suitable for simple dimensional analysis, follow $k^{-5/3}$ and $k^{-7/3}$ scalings: Biskamp et al. (1999) first proposed and presented (in slightly different situations) such scalings, and their Fig. 8b with electron skin depth $d_e \ll 1$ does correspond to the forward energy cascade of our case. The scale separation between the dominant dynamics of the two cascade quantities of PMD (or EMHD) is weaker than 2D fluid turbulence in the sense that the spectral ratio is, with some self-cancelation between the two chiral sectors, at most k instead of k^2. So, at finite Reynolds numbers, cascade of either definitely is accompanied by stronger (than 2D turbulence) leaking of the other. The subdominant energy transfer, accompanying the inverse helicity transfer and vanishing at high Reynolds number limit, should not be recognized to be inverse energy cascade. †

---

‡ It should be pointed out that there have been many other interesting AE-relevant investigations for different dynamical models and on various specific physical issues, the important one of which is relevant to a background magnetic mean field and anisotropic fluctuations and has been continuously attacked in the last several decades. Extra particular studies should be done, though brief relevant remarks will be offered at the appropriate circumstances.

The basic feature of the PMD result in the above is also central to all other MHD models with magnetic field, concerning the issue of magnetic helicity inverse transfers/cascades. For the general PMD with finite d_e (used for scale normalization), the "frozen-in" generalized vorticity is $\nabla\times\boldsymbol{P}_e = \nabla\times\boldsymbol{u}_e - \boldsymbol{B}$ with $\boldsymbol{P}_e = \boldsymbol{u}_e - \boldsymbol{A}$. The rugged invariants are then (see, e.g., Biskamp et al. (1999)) total energy and generalized helicity $\mathcal{E} = \frac{1}{2\mathcal{V}}\int(\boldsymbol{B}^2 + \boldsymbol{u}_e^2)d^3\boldsymbol{r},\ \mathcal{H}_G = \frac{1}{2\mathcal{V}}\int \nabla\times\boldsymbol{P}_e\cdot\boldsymbol{P}_e d^3\boldsymbol{r}$, resulting in $U_M^c(k) = k/\{(k^2+1)[c\beta(k^2+1)+\alpha k]\}$, which complicates the quantitative transitional spectral behaviors (*c.f.*, §2.3.2 for such similar situations in two-fluid MHD). In the other limit regime of scales much smaller than d_e, $U_M^c(k) \to 1/[k^2(c\beta k + \alpha)]$ whose main feature is similar to the pure hydrodynamic case (see the discussions in the next subsection) supporting both energy and helicity cascading forwardly (*c.f.*, Fig. 8a of Biskamp et al. 1999), which is not surprising since electron kinetic behavior dominates.

2.2. *Pure hydrodynamics (PHD)*

For the classical incompressible PHD, *i.e.*, $\partial_t\boldsymbol{u} + \boldsymbol{u}\cdot\nabla\boldsymbol{u} = -\nabla p$, where the pressure p can be eliminated by $\nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{u} = 0$, the rugged invariants are kinetic energy and helicity

$$\mathcal{E}_K = \frac{1}{2\mathcal{V}}\int \boldsymbol{u}^2 d^3\boldsymbol{r},\ \mathcal{H}_K = \frac{1}{2\mathcal{V}}\int \nabla\times\boldsymbol{u}\cdot\boldsymbol{u}d^3\boldsymbol{r},$$

which lead to the decomposition of K73 densities (*c.f.*, §1) into separate chiral sectors:

$$U_K^c(k) = 1/(\alpha + c\beta k),\ Q_K^c(k) = ckU_K^c(k). \tag{2.2}$$

If both sectors present, cancelation between the two sectors results in lower net helicity density $Q_K(k) = \sum_c Q_K^c(k)$, but, if not, one can not derive from the above

$$\alpha = [U_K^-(k) + U_K^+(k)]/[2U_K^+(k)U_K^-(k)],\ \beta = [U_K^-(k) - U_K^+(k)]/[2kU_K^+(k)U_K^-(k)] \tag{2.3}$$

which are, in particular, not true for any k in the unichiral case with only one, say, the positive chiral sector: Eq. (2.2) shows that the low helicity state corresponds to a negative α with a sharp peak at the lowest modes $k_{min} > k_p = |\alpha/\beta|$ close to the positive simple pole k_p with a $\llcorner$ shape energy spectral density, just as K67 and (in contrast to) PMD in §2.1, supporting inverse energy and forward helicity transfers. Biferale, Musacchio & Toschi (2012) did realize inverse energy cascade with a thorough truncation of one of the sector of Navier-Stokes.

If both sectors present realizability conditions $\alpha > 0$ and $k_{max} < \alpha/|\beta|$ allow *only* $\lrcorner$ shape spectral densities, without large-scale concentration. Thus, inverse cascade in PHD generally needs other special treatments as reviewed by Yang, Su & Wu (2010) and Biferale, Musacchio & Toschi (2012). Note that, such large-k peak is dominated by one of the chiral sector with its positive simple pole. Although, unlike at large scales, normal dissipation would devastatingly ruin such small-scale AE structure, some residuals of such intrinsic nonlinearity effects may persist. Indeed, the fluxes of the two chiral sectors reported by Chen, Chen & Eyink (2003) do show systematic differences: According to the working conditions, their Figs. 2–5 correspond to the case with positive helicity, that is, the positive pole belongs to the positive sector with negative β. Dominance of the positive sector of AE spectrum indicates that nonlinearity should support the transfer of this sector to be dominant and more persistent, consistent with the results and analyses of Chen, Chen & Eyink (2003). The large-k viscous effect efficiently restores the reflexion symmetry and the degree of (local-in-k) chirality measured by relative helicity decrease as k^{-1} throughout the $k^{-5/3}$ inertial range (Kraichnan 1973). The large-k pole effect of one chiral sector nevertheless provides a prototype for other similar possible physics (such as that introduced by two-fluid effect in MHD as we will see in §2.3.2) in more complex situations. Note that in the PMD case, the realizability condition is $\alpha > 0$ and $k_{min} > |\beta|/\alpha$, and the $\llcorner$ shape spectrum is the only possibility.

---

† Particular care should be taken for the decaying case which is exactly the simulation by Cho (2011), who, by "inverse energy cascade", meant merely the backward shift of the peak of his energy spectrum, which is nothing genuine in connect to the conventional notion of inertial cascade and which is not in conflict with our statement of forward energy cascade (Private communication).

Now, suppose we have one pair of conjugate alien, *i.e.*, negative, helical modes at k_{min} much smaller than the injection wavenumber k_{in}, and that there is no negative temperature state to support a conventional inverse energy cascade argument *a la* K67. Will energy abruptly turn to cascade forwardly, or there should be a transitional behavior? Consider Eqs. (2.2) and (2.3) with $\alpha > 0$ and $\beta > 0$, and suppose energy is injected at some intermediate k_{in}. These alien modes may help transfer extra positive helicity nonlocally to small scales, by which, though, their own negative helicity (and energy) would have to increase. The growth of these alien modes is allowed, even in the sense of AE, with α/β approaching k_{min}. There may or may not be a nonzero forward nonlocal transfer of energy to small scales in the infinite Reynolds number limit: Depending on the strength of the nonlocal beating of the alien modes, the statement "the direct helicity cascade carries also a residual, nonconstant flux of kinetic energy toward small scales ... vanishes in the high Reynolds number limit" in Biferale, Musacchio & Toschi (2012) may or may not hold any more. If there is, it is just that the injected energy is partitioned to be transferred to two opposite directions. With more aliens, forward transfer will be more. And, to transit to a state with all energy completely cascading forwardly, sufficient aliens must be added to k larger than the injection wavenumber.

2.3. *Magneto-hydro-dynamics (MHD)*

Here we study the classical single-fluid and the most general two-fluid MHDs, for a minimal but sufficient examination. From the plasma physics point of view, two-fluid MHD is for a more complete description of the dynamics/scales between those of EMHD and single-fluid MHD.

2.3.1. *Single-fluid MHD*

Classical ideal (single fluid) MHD equations are $\partial_t \boldsymbol{u} = -(\boldsymbol{u}\cdot\nabla)\boldsymbol{u} + (\boldsymbol{B}\cdot\nabla)\boldsymbol{B} - \nabla p$, $\partial_t \boldsymbol{B} = -(\boldsymbol{u}\cdot\nabla)\boldsymbol{B} + (\boldsymbol{B}\cdot\nabla)\boldsymbol{u}$, with $\nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{u} = 0$ and $\nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{B} = 0$. Rugged invariants are total energy, magnetic helicity and cross helicity (see, *e.g.*, Woltjer 1958; Frisch et al. 1975),

$$\mathcal{E} = \frac{1}{2\mathcal{V}}\int [\boldsymbol{u}^2 + \boldsymbol{B}^2] d^3\boldsymbol{r},\ \mathcal{H}_M = \frac{1}{2\mathcal{V}}\int \boldsymbol{A}\cdot\boldsymbol{B} d^3\boldsymbol{r},\ \mathcal{H}_C = \frac{1}{2\mathcal{V}}\int \boldsymbol{u}\cdot\boldsymbol{B} d^3\boldsymbol{r},$$

which, together with Eq. (1.1), leads to (*c.f.*, §1, also for notations)

$$U_K^c(k) = \frac{4(\alpha\, k + c\beta_M)}{(4\,\alpha^2 - {\beta_C}^2)k + c4\,\alpha\,\beta_M},\ U_M^c(k) = \frac{4(\alpha\, k)}{(4\,\alpha^2 - {\beta_C}^2)k + c4\,\alpha\,\beta_M}, \tag{2.4}$$

$$Q_M^c(k) = \frac{c}{k}U_M^c(k),\ Q_K^c(k) = ckU_K^c(k),\ Q_C^c(k) = \frac{-2\beta_C k}{(4\,\alpha^2 - {\beta_C}^2)k + c4\,\alpha\,\beta_M}. \tag{2.5}$$

Our result chirally splits that of Frisch et al. (1975) following which we start with the case of zero cross helicity with $\beta_C = 0$ for discussions: $Q_M^c(k)$ with $sgn(c\beta_M) = -1$ is responsible for the condensation of Q_M at small k, around the positive simple pole $k_p = -c\beta_M/\alpha$. When the dynamics is dominated by the $c = +$ ($c = -$) sector, it is simply to say that large positive (negative) magnetic helicity state corresponds to a negative (positive) β_M with a $\llcorner$ shape spectral density is favored. The other sector's pole has the opposite sign and is not reachable, thus, without such a mechanism of large-scale attraction, it would be transferred to small scales or simply less excited. When β_C (or $\mathcal{H}_C$) is nonzero, the prefactor before k in the denominators quantitatively changes, but the qualitative picture is not altered. At large scales, the spectrum is overwhelmingly dominated by OCSDS and so is basically force free. Note that such large-scale nearly force-free state is different to that of Chandrasekhar-Woltjer one which is global and pure (Woltjer 1958, and references therein). The common feature is that the invariant of cross helicity does not essentially change the physics.

The new theoretical insight is OCSDS which actually can be found in the numerical data documented by this group: Pouquet, Frisch & Léorat (1976) carried out systematic study of eddy-damped quasi-normal Markovian MHD turbulence and nonlinear dynamo with the data of their Figs. 4 and 5 around $k = 0.16$ (it is actually reasonable to say "starting from the beginning of the inertial range to ever larger scales"), and, of Figs. 8 and 9 around $k = 0.1$ (actually also $k = 2$), showing clearly OCSDSs. Meneguzzi, Frisch & Pouquet (1981) then revealed with direct numerical simulations that "the large-scale $\boldsymbol{B}$ is mostly force free and produces only very little large-scale motion," with the relatively magnetic helicity density $|kQ_M(k)/U_M(k)|$ being close to 1 (nearly maximally helical), as is how we recognize the OCSDSs in Pouquet, Frisch & Léorat (1976). Recent simulations such as Fig. 21 of Brandenburg, Dobler & Subramanian (2002), with postprocessing using helical decomposition, also explicitly shows OCSDSs. We won't go too far into much more details, but just remark that the pertinent discussion of Pouquet, Frisch & Léorat (1976, p. 345, second paragraph) can also be elaborated with finer chiral-sector dynamics. We only want to remark that relaxation of magnetic helicity to the largest scales does not necessarily indicate local cascade, nonlocal transfer also is possible, and such a relaxation/thermalization mechanism due to the intrinsic dynamics is not conceptually in conflict with other more mechanical theories, such as mean field alpha effect. The observed OCSDS in consistent with absolute equilibrium indicates that those large scales may actually be close to statistical equilibrium state when they are more or less saturated.

Interestingly, even in the extremely strong sense of "non-helical" state with $Q_M(k) = Q_K(k) = 0$, *i.e.*, the two chiral sectors of both magnetic and velocity fields being balanced on each wavenumber, AE seems to still support the so-called non-helical turbulent dynamo, in the sense of Pouquet, Frisch & Léorat (1976) and Meneguzzi, Frisch & Pouquet (1981). The reason is that, in this situation, while energy (either kinetic or magnetic) is equipartitioned into each helical mode, magnetic helicities of both sectors with opposite signs are "attracted" by the same pole $k_p = 0$. Such attraction is, by simple local eddy turn-over time argument, weaker than the condensation around a finite positive pole as the $\beta_M \neq 0$ case. Note that unlike PMD (§2.1), magnetic energy itself here is not conserved and kinetic energy can be transformed to it to ease the inverse magnetic helicity transfers for the two chiral sectors simultaneously. One may also relate such vanishing magnetic helicity case to the situation with a background magnetic mean field $\boldsymbol{B}_0$, noting that though fluctuating net magnetic helicity is not an invariant any more, to our best knowledge, no indication of any strengthening of magnetic helicity going to small scales due to $\boldsymbol{B}_0$ has been reported (see, *e.g.*, Stribling, Matthaeus & Ghosh 1994): "Decay" of some net magnetic helicity due to $\boldsymbol{B}_0$ does not necessarily prevent either chiral sector going to large scales. Actually, taking $k_{min} = 0$ in the AE treatment provides a kind of self-consistency: The magnetic field simply goes to the infinitely large scales in the statistical ensemble as a relaxation/thermalization effect. Note also that Pouquet, Frisch & Léorat (1976) and Meneguzzi, Frisch & Pouquet (1981), and other isotropic MHD simulations with unit Prandtl number, found a slight excess of magnetic energy at small scales, which may be due to such "attraction" from large scales. Without decomposition, as net helicity (at any k) is seen to be zero, researchers traditionally have not seriously thought about the simultaneous backward transfer of both sectors, to our best knowledge.

2.3.2. *Two-fluid MHD*

Two-fluid effects are important in many laboratory and astrophysical situations (see, *e.g.*, Yamada et al. 2002; Brandenburg & Subramanian 2005). The ideal incompressible two-fluid MHD states that the generalized vorticities $\nabla \times \boldsymbol{P}_s$ (see below) for each species s are "frozen in" to the respective flows (see, *e.g.*, Ruban 1999, and references therein) $m_s n_s \frac{d\boldsymbol{u}_s}{dt} = q_s n_s(\boldsymbol{E} + \boldsymbol{u}_s \times \boldsymbol{B}) - \nabla p_s$. Since this model has very rich physics, to remind ourselves the relevant context and the weights of physical quantities in quantifying chirality (instead of being purely geometrical, as discussed in Petitjean 2003), we now use the normalization which keeps some physical parameters explicitly, unlike those in EMHD and single-fluid MHD. The model is Hamiltonian with canonical momenta $\boldsymbol{P}_s = m_s\boldsymbol{u}_s + q_s\boldsymbol{A}$, constrained by the rugged invariants, total energy and self-helicities:

$$\mathcal{E} = \frac{1}{2\mathcal{V}}\int [\boldsymbol{E}^2 + \boldsymbol{B}^2 + \sum_{\tilde{s}} m_{\tilde{s}} n_{\tilde{s}} \boldsymbol{u}_{\tilde{s}}^2] d^3\boldsymbol{r} \text{ and } \mathcal{H}_s = \frac{1}{2\mathcal{V}}\int \nabla \times \boldsymbol{P}_s \cdot \boldsymbol{P}_s d^3\boldsymbol{r},$$

where $\boldsymbol{E}$ is the electric field vector; q_s and m_s are charge and mass. Here, two-fluid effects present through the extra terms in the invariants compared to single-fluid MHD.

With Eq. (1.1), we are led to the following AE spectra densities (*c.f.*, §1 also for notations)

$$\begin{aligned}
&Q^c_M(k) = \frac{c}{k}U^c_M(k),\ U^c_M(k) = \frac{kT(k)}{D^c(k)},\ U^c_{sK}(k) = \frac{N^c_s(k)}{D^c(k)},\ Q^c_{sC}(k) = \frac{q_s\beta_s L_{\bar{s}}(k)}{-D^c(k)/k},\\
&Q^c_{sK}(k) = ckU^c_{sK}(k) \text{ and } Q^c_s(k) = m_s^2 Q^c_{sK}(k) + 2m_s q_s Q^c_{sC}(k) + q_s^2 Q^c_M(k) \text{ with} \qquad (2.6)\\
&D^c(k) = \alpha\ k[T(k) + (\textstyle\sum_{\tilde{s}} q^2_{\tilde{s}} n_{\tilde{s}} m_{\bar{\tilde{s}}})\prod_{\tilde{s}}\beta_{\tilde{s}}] + \underline{c\alpha O\textstyle\prod_{\tilde{s}} n_{\tilde{s}}},\ L_s(k) = \alpha\, n_s + c\beta_s m_s k,\\
&m_s N^c_s(k) = k[\alpha L_{\bar{s}}(k) + q_s^2 m_{\bar{s}}\textstyle\prod_{\tilde{s}}\beta_{\tilde{s}}] + \underline{c n_{\bar{s}} O},\ O = \alpha\textstyle\sum_{\tilde{s}} q^2_{\tilde{s}}\beta_{\tilde{s}} \text{ and } T(k) = \prod_{\tilde{s}} L_{\tilde{s}}(k),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{s}$ means the other species than s and where the index C is for the "cross" helicity as defined in §2.3.1. We summarize the situations of possible interesting physical relevance:†

First. Again, the poles, *i.e.*, roots of the third order polynomials $D^c(k)$, of the two sectors are of opposite signs, as c appears in the second and zeroth order terms.

Second. There can be a single positive real pole (and the corresponding one with opposite sign), provided the others are complex. Similar to the PMD (§2.1) in the scale regime much larger than the electron skin depth d_e or single-fluid MHD (§2.3.1) case, a ⌊ shape spectral density presents, "attracting" most of the magnetic helicity of that sector and that supporting an inverse magnetic helicity OCSDS. When this pole is at the right end, *i.e.*, when ⌋ shape spectral density is the case, the situation corresponds to the dominance of small-scale dynamics. Like PHD (§2.2, *c.f.*, also the discussion in the end of §2.1 for the regime of scales much smaller than d_e), the scenario of "everything" cascading forwardly is supported. As noted in §2.2, small-scale OCSDS of AE state is generally devastatingly destroyed by viscosity and/or resistivity, though some residuals can remain.

---

† The result unavoidably appearing a bit complicated, it may be helpful for readers to focus on $U^c_M(k)$ and $Q^c_M(k)$ first. Further simplification of these formulae can be made for some situations. For instance, electron-positron plasma with mass equivalence and charge conjugation enables us to take all masses and charges be normalized unity. But, for our purposes here, taking D^c as polynomials of k with the fundamental theorem of algebra and Vieta's formulas in mind suffices. Note that we have general formula for the roots whose nature is determined by the discriminant. The parameter regimes, constrained by the realizability condition, in the following cases can be obtained with such basic knowledge by some simple but tedious manipulations and are omitted here.

Third. A $\bigsqcup$ shape spectral density ($Q_M(k)$, say) may be confined inbetween two distinct positive poles, belonging to the same chiral sector or not, which presents cross-scale (*e.g.*, going across the ion or electron skin depthes etc.) behavior: The general EMHD in §2.1 with finite electron inertial can already partly have such a feature. The general effects can be understood with the combination of the above two cases in the *second* case. And, the large-k peak may also be relevant to small-scale field generation [relevant to the battery mechanisms: see, *e.g.*, Brandenburg & Subramanian (2005).]

Last. If $O = 0$ in the zeroth order terms underlined in Eq. (2.6), magnetic helicity does not act in constraining the AE ensemble through $\sum_{\tilde{s}} \beta_{\tilde{s}} \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{s}}$ (*c.f.*, §1). [Note that $k = 0$ does not become a pole for this situation, as every spectrum of Eq. (2.6) has a factor of k to cancel it.] Since now $\prod_{\tilde{s}} \beta_{\tilde{s}} < 0$, we can see that this case is similar to the last situation of K67 considered by Kraichnan (1967, p. 1423), with our $[T(k)]^{-1} > 0$ (from the realizability conditions) being eligible to act the role of k^2 there [$\bar{U}_K(k)$ in §1]. This corresponds to a $\lrcorner$ shape spectral density, which may be viewed as another demonstration of two-fluid effects of small-scale enhancement. The pole for large-scale concentration is gone now (only Q^c_M, by definition, has $k = 0$ as the asymptotic pole as in single-fluid MHD). We thus can conclude that magnetic helicity constraint under two-fluid framework is still crucial for large scale concentration of magnetic fields, as in single-fluid MHD where it is conserved.

Careful analyses with appropriate choices of the physical parameters can be made for detailed illustration and more subtle implications. Similarly is for Hall MHD [and general EMHD with finite electron inertial (§2.1)] whose result is a bit simpler, with the denominators being polynomials of second order. From the plasma physics point of view, it is very interesting to spell out all detailed effects of each physical element (skin depths, mass ratio effects etc.), which however is not the focus of this paper. We have to refrain from treating these cases in too great a detail, because, except possibly for some special situations, such as largest scales far from stirring scale, turbulence is in general far from equilibrium with other important effects. Residuals of AE results may persist but require the assistance of other tools for more accurate analyses.

The major contribution of this subsection is confirming and further illustrating two things: One is the generic OCSDS, due to approaching the pole of one chiral sector of AE spectrum; the other is the importance of magnetic helicity.

3. Concluding remarks

Just as the (Gauss) linking number (the imbalance of the positive and negative crossings) is a rather rough invariant of linkage, so is helicity for turbulent fields. Looking into the finer structures has proved to be helpful. Turbulence statistics can be sharpened with helical decomposition, which has been well discerned since Moffatt (1970) and Kraichnan (1973) and has become fully workable since Waleffe (1992) [see also Moses (1971).] We have merely focused on the most basic AE aspect concerning the direction of spectral transfer, and, its selection and amplification of chirality, which can be quantified by helicity and relevant derivatives such as the relative helicity (Kraichnan 1973). The key point is that although the dynamics of the two chiral sectors are in general coupled, the absolute equilibrium are cleanly split into two independent sectors. And the pole(s) of AE spectra of opposite chiral sector are of opposite sign, which makes one of the sector overwhelmingly dominate around its pole. Some reported relevant numerical results have been accordingly addressed/explained, but evidently much more numerical work carefully looking into the two chiral sectors are still wanted.

The vanishing-d_e EMHD result for OCSDS of magnetic helicity (transfer) lies in the core also of other MHD models, including single-fluid and two-fluid MHDs, and is generic. Two-fluid MHD has the most general and complete elements of helicities and show convincingly the crucial role of magnetic helicity. It is fundamentally due to the mathematical definition

$Q_K^c(k) = kU_K^c(k)$ and $Q_M^c(k) = U_M^c(k)/k$ which show that magnetic helicity belongs more to large scales. One "artificial" way to look at it is the following: The gyrofrequency of a charged particle's helical motion around $\boldsymbol{B}$ is $\Omega = qB/m$, which means that we can formally take the $\boldsymbol{B}$-line as "kinetic vorticity" $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$-line, macroscopically†. This then gives various helicities a kind of unified description and relate magnetic helicity to the more "intrinsic" plasma particle motion, which is also reminiscent of the orbital and spin angular momenta, and, the conservation of the total. There are also other supports of the robustness of magnetic helicity (see, e.g., Brandenburg & Subramanian 2005), such as analysis with more general context (Berger & Field 1984) and measurements (Ji 1999). As for large-scale nearly force-free state, the scale-dependent degree of chirality is explicit in our result, which is different to other approaches such as the Chandrasekhar-Woltjer one by variation and stability analyses (see, *e.g.*, Woltjer 1958, and references therein.) Such symmetry breaking, signatured by net helicity, and its amplification along larger scales to the asymptotic force-free state has got clearer support from numerical results.

The large-d_e EMHD or PHD situation is different, in the sense that the realizable AE spectra can only have positive pole at large k which regime however is subject to dissipation in real physical systems. That is, reflexion symmetry breaking and restoration mechanisms meet at the same battlefield and they reach another kind of equilibrium (balance) which is far from our statistical absolute equilibrium, whose implications and residuals can however still be identified.

Two-fluid model can present all the above situations, even in a united way. To have more accurate knowledge of the definite plasma physical processes, a combination of the insights from our study with careful simulations *a la* Chen, Chen & Eyink (2003) is promising.

In any case, chirally decomposed AE with OCSDS does bring some clear new insights and further clarify the relevant issues. The results may also be useful in understanding or help designing special truncation schemes, such as those *a la* Biferale, Musacchio & Toschi (2012), for isolating specific physics.

This work was supported by the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities of China and is supported by the WCI Program of the NRF of Korea [WCI 2009-001]. We thank L. Biferale, M. Faganello, M. Petitjean and V. P. Ruban for correspondences, C.-K. Chan, Z.-B. Guo, S. Kurien, E. A. Kuznetsov, Z.-W. Xia, and D.-D. Zou for discussions. JZZ is grateful for the hospitality of the International Institute for Fusion Science, Université de Provence, and for the interactions provided by the 2011 NORDITA workshop "The Solar Course, the Chemic Force, and the Speeding Change of Water".

REFERENCES

BERGER, M. A & FIELD, G.B. 1984 The topological properties of magnetic helicity. J. Fluid Mech. **147**, 133–148.

BETCHOV, R. 1961 Semi-isotropic turbulence and helicoidal flows. Phys. Fluids **4**, 925–926.

BIFERALE, L., MUSACCHIO, S. & TOSCHI, F. 2012 Inverse energy cascade in three-dimensional isotropic turbulence. Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 104501–104504.

BISKAMP, D., SCHWARZ, E., ZEILER, A. CELANI & DRAKE J. F. 1999 Electron magnetohydrodynamic turbulence. Phys. Plasmas **6**, 751–758.

BRANDENBURG, A., DOBLER W. & SUBRAMANIAN, K. 2002 Magnetic helicity in stellar dynamos: new numerical experiments. Astron. Nachr. **323**, 99–123.

BRANDENBURG, A. & SUBRAMANIAN, K. 2005 Astrophysical magnetic fields and nonlinear dynamo theory. Physics Reports **417**, 1–209.

CHEN, Q. N., CHEN, S. Y. & EYINK, G. L. 2003 The joint cascade of energy and helicity in three-dimensional turbulence. Phys. Fluids **15** (2), 361–374.

CHO, J. 2011 Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 191104–191107.

---

† Physically, as we know magnetic field is indeed, like vorticity, a *pseudovector*. And, note also the well-known dynamical analogy between them initiated by Batchelor (see, *e.g.*, Moffatt 2008).

CINTAS, P. & VIEDMA, C. 2012 On the Physical Basis of Asymmetry and Homochirality. Chirality **24**, 894–908.

FRISCH, U., POUQUET, A., LEORAT, J. & MAZURE, A. 1975 Possibility of an inverse magnetic helicity cascade in magnetohydrodynamic turbulence. J. Fluid Mech. **68**, 769–778.

GALTIER, S. & BHATTACHARJEE, A. 2003 Anisotropic weak whistler wave turbulence in electron magnetohydrodynamics. Phys. Plasmas **10**, 3065–3076.

GALTIER, S., NAZARENKO, S., NEWELL, A. & POUQUET, A. 2000 A weak turbulence theory for incompressible magnetohydrodynamics. J. Plasma Physics **63**, 447–488.

JI, H. 1999 Turbulent dynamos and magnetic helicity. Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 3198–3191.

KELVIN, W. THOMSON 1904 Baltimore Lectures on Molecular Dynamics and the Wave Theory of Light. C. J. Clay and Sons, Cambridge University Press Warehouse: London.

KRAICHNAN, R. H. 1967 Inertial ranges in two-dimensional turbulence. Phys. Fluids **102**, 1417–1423.

KRAICHNAN, R. H. 1973 Helical turbulence and absolute equilibrium. J. Fluid Mech. **59**, 745–752.

LEE, T.-D. 1952 On some statistical properties of hydrodynamic and hydromagnetic fields. Q. Appl. Math. **10**, 69–74).

LESSINNES, T., PLUNIAN F. & CARATI, D. 2009 Helical shell models for MHD. Theor. Comput. Fluid Dyn. **23**, 439–450.

MENEGUZZI, M, FRISCH, U AND POUQUET, A 1981 Helical and nonhelical turbulent dynamos. Phys. Rev. Lett. **47**, 1060–1063.

MOFFATT, H. K. 1970 J. Fluid Mech. **41**, 435–452.

MOFFATT, H. K. 2008 Vortex Dynamics: The Legacy of Helmholtz and Kelvin. In Hamiltonian Dynamics, Vortex Structures, Turbulence (ed. A.V. Borisov, V.V. Kozlov, I.S. Mamaev & M.A. Sokolovskiy), pp. 113–138. Springer.

MOSES, H. E. 1971 Eigenfunctions of the curl operator, rotationally invariant Helmholtz theorem and applications to electromagnetic theory and ?uid mechanics. SIAM (Soc. Ind. Appl. Math.) J. Appl. Math. **21**, 114–130.

WOLTJER, L. 1958 A THEOREM ON FORCE-FREE MAGNETIC FIELDS. Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. **44** 489–491.

PETITJEAN, M. 2003 Chirality and Symmetry Measures: A Transdisciplinary Review. Entropy **5**, 271-312.

POUQUET, A., FRISCH, U. & LÉORAT, J. 1976 Strong MHD helical turbulence and the nonlinear dynamo effect. J. Fluid Mech. **77**, 321–354.

RUBAN, V. P. 1999 Motion of magnetic flux lines in magnetohydrodynamics. Sov. Phys. JETP **89**, 299–310.

STENZEL, R. L. 1999 Whistler waves in space and laboratory plasmas. J. Geophys. Res. **14**, 14379–14395.

STRIBLING, T., MATTHAEUS, W. H. & GHOSH, S. 1994 Nonlinear decay of magnetic helicity in magnetohydrodynamic turbulence with a mean magnetic field. J. Geophys. Res. **99**, 2567–2576.

WALEFFE, F. 1992 The nature of triad interactions in homogeneous turbulence. Phys. Fluids A **4**, 350–363.

YAMADA, H., KATANO, T., KANAI, K., ISHIDA, A. & STEINHAUER, L. 2002 Equilibrium analysis of a flowing two-fluid plasma. Phys. Plasmas **11**, 4605–4614.

YANG, Y.-T., SU, W.-D. & WU, J.-Z. 2010 Helical-wave decomposition and applications to channel turbulence with streamwise rotation. J. Fluid Mech. **662**, 91–122.